

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2009, and the Advisory Action mailed on February 3, 2010.

In the Advisory Action mailed February 3, 2010, it was indicated that the amendment filed by Applicant on November 17, 2009 would not be entered since it raised new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the amendment filed by Applicant on November 17, 2009 not be entered, and that the amendment currently enclosed herewith be entered instead.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed November 17, 2009, Claims 34-66 and 68-72 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 34-42, 44-66 and 69-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,750, hereinafter Burd). Claims 43, 60 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 as being unpatentable over Burd in view of Witwer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0098360, hereinafter Witwer).

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Reply amends Claims 34, 36-37, 50, 53, 55-56, 62, and 72, cancel Claims 35, 38, 54, and 57, and adds new Claims 73-74, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 34, 36-37, 39-53, 55-56, 58-66 and 68-74.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, Claims 34-42, 44-66 and 69-72 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burd et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,961,750, hereinafter Burd).

Claims 43, 60 and 68 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burd in view of Witwer et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0098360, hereinafter Witwer).

Claim 34

Claim 34 has been amended to recite the following:

34. (Currently Amended) *A method for rendering a graphical user interface (GUI), comprising:*

providing for the representation of the GUI as a plurality of objects, wherein each object of the plurality of objects represents a control in the GUI, wherein each said object is associated with one or more states in a lifecycle of the control, wherein the state information of each said object can be persisted using a state management persistence mechanism;

receiving, from a client, a request to render the GUI, wherein the request contains the state information for each said object;

generating a logical hierarchy for the plurality of objects, in a container, using metadata, wherein the metadata is based on one or more definitions in a page description language, and wherein the metadata includes information about properties, events, and model binding that have values set in page descriptions;

using a control state reader chain to read the state information in the request, wherein the control state reader chain contains one or more control state readers, wherein each control state reader operates to read the state information for at least one said object, and wherein the container can find a corresponding control state reader for a particular control;

updating the logical hierarchy based on the state information; and

generating a response based on the updated logical hierarchy and returning the response to the client

Burd discloses that a server-side control object processes and generates a client-side user interface element for display on a web page. Multiple server-side control objects may be combined into a hierarchy of server-side control objects that cooperate to generate the resulting authoring language code, such as HTML, for displaying a web page on a client (Abstract). Burd further discloses that state management of the server-side control objects is supported in a Load operation and a Save operation, which use a transportable state structure to accommodate the stateless model for client server systems by restoring server-side control objects to their previous states (Column 16, Lines 1-6).

Witwer discloses that the life portal service provider may allow the user to modify, to some degree, the look and feel of the life portal (Paragraph [0040]).

Applicant also respectfully submits that neither Burd, nor other cited references disclose or render obvious that a control state reader chain that contains one or more control state readers can be used to read the state information in the request, wherein each control state reader operates to read the state information for at least one said object, and the container can find a corresponding control state reader for a particular control. Claim 34 has been amended to more clearly recite this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 34, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 50

The comments provided above with regard to Claims 50 are herein incorporated by reference. Claims 50 have been similarly amended to Claim 34 to more clearly recite the embodiments therein. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 50, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, when considered alone or in combination. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 36-37, 39-49, 51-53, 55-56, 58-66 and 68-74

Claims 36-37, 39-49, 51-53, 55-56, 58-66 and 68-74 depend from and include all of the features of Claims 34 and 50. Claims 36-37, 39-49, 51-53, 55-56, 58-66 and 68-74 are not addressed in detail herein. Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are allowable at least as they depend from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the amendments to the independent claims, and the comments provided above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 72

Claim 72 includes a feature of "*using a streaming control tree factory to create the control tree from an XML stream, wherein the XML stream is obtained from multiple resources, wherein the streaming control tree factory can map each user into an individual control stream and regenerate the control tree if the XML stream changes.*"

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no indication in Burd that the XML stream is obtained from multiple resources, and there is also no indication in Burd that the streaming control tree factory can map each user into an individual control stream.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 72, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Additional Amendments

Claims 73 and 74 have been added by the present Reply. Applicant respectfully requests that new Claims 73 and 74 be included in the Application and considered therewith.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 17, 2010

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No.: 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800